

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 28 2008

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE.

In re Application of

November 28 2008

Sten R. Gerfast CUSTOMER NUMBER 000080990

Serial No. 10/733,944

Group art unit 2834

Filed 12/12/03

Examiner Tran N. Nguyen

For GENERATOR WITH OUTPUT OPTIONS AND LOW LOSS WINDINGS.

Commissioner of Patents FAX 571 273 8300 Attention: Office of Petitions
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Response to: Copy mailed from Office of Petitions on Nov.24 2008; Received TODAY, Nov 28 2008,
and replied to TODAY, Nov 28 2008.

Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) to Revive an application Abandoned Due to Unintentional Delay.

I am the applicant in the above stated Application requesting the withdrawal of Abandonment.

The ongoing contention is that the Petitioner has not paid the Petition Fee,

even though the Petitioner's records show that he has paid a total of \$ 1783 on Serial No. 10/733,944.

One page of Credit card payment for \$900 (faxed on June 27 2008, is enclosed; marked FEE HISTORY No.1).

One page of Fee History for \$ 1783 (faxed on June 27 2008, is enclosed; marked FEE HISTORY No.2).

The Petitioner assumes that the faxed Credit card payment for \$900 was not recognized at the mail room.

If it does show up, please stop payment on it. A new credit card payment for \$ 810 is faxed today, Nov 28/08.

Please find enclosed:

- 1) A Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) to Revive an application Abandoned Due to Unintentional Delay.
- 2) A new Credit card form for the Petition Fee of \$ 810.
- 3) A background of timely submitted Replies by the Applicant..... to Office action Papers received,
in this application.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 28 2008

BACKGROUND.

The Applicant **did not fail** to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office Action mailed on May 20 **2005**, **6 pages of reply mailed May 31 2005** are enclosed.

Almost **a year later** (June 16 **2006**) a Non-compliant Amendment was answered (Faxed) by the Applicant on June 23 2006.

Copy of PTO auto Reply; 7 pages received by PTO on 6/23/2006 enclosed. (Plus 6 pages on 4/2 /2006)
The **Applicant did not fail to reply.**

About **a year later** a Communication on June 12 **2007** was answered by the Applicant on June 25 2007. The answer to the Examiner also included a letter to the Supervisor pleading for clarifications and answers. 2 Pages enclosed.

The **Applicant did not fail to reply.**

A denoted Notification of Fee Due (\$ 60) on June 27 2007 was newer received by the Applicant.

This also serves as an affidavit that the Applicant has acted with candor and good faith,

and that the abandonment of this Application was unintentional. The Applicant's

reply to any paper from PTO have been answered by the Applicant within 3 to 4 weeks, [Diligence],

For other information please re-read 24 Pages Faxed on April 7 2008.

Entry of the Petition is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted

Sten Gerfast Nov 28 2008 Customer number 000080990 November 28 2008

Sten Gerfast 1802 Valley Curve, Mendota Heights, MN 55118. 651 454 1923

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 28 2008

PTO/SB/64 (11-08)

Approved for use through 12/31/2008, OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

ENUEWED

**PETITION FOR REVIVAL OF AN APPLICATION FOR PATENT
ABANDONED UNINTENTIONALLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b)**

Docket Number (Optional)

First named inventor: STEN R. GERFASTApplication No.: 10/733,944Art Unit: 2834Filed: 12-12-2003Examiner: TRAN N. NGUYENTitle: GENERATOR WITH OUTPUT OPTIONS
AND LOW LOSS WINDINGS

Attention: Office of Petitions
Mail Stop Petition
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
FAX (571) 273-8300

NOTE: If information or assistance is needed in completing this form, please contact Petitions
Information at (571) 272-3282.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to file a timely and proper reply to a notice or
action by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The date of abandonment is the day after the expiration
date of the period set for reply in the office notice or action plus an extensions of time actually obtained.

APPLICANT HEREBY PETITIONS FOR REVIVAL OF THIS APPLICATION

NOTE: A grantable petition requires the following items:

- (1) Petition fee;
- (2) Reply and/or issue fee;
- (3) Terminal disclaimer with disclaimer fee - required for all utility and plant applications
filed before June 8, 1995; and for all design applications; and
- (4) Statement that the entire delay was unintentional.

1. Petition fee

☒ Small entity-fee \$ 810 (37 CFR 1.17(m)). Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27.

☐ Other than small entity - fee \$ _____ (37 CFR 1.17(m))

2. Reply and/or fee

A. The reply and/or fee to the above-noted Office action in
the form of PETITION (2 PAGES) 6 PAGES FROM 44531-05 (identify type of reply):

☐ has been filed previously on _____
☒ is enclosed herewith.

16 PAGES TOTAL

B. The issue fee and publication fee (if applicable) of \$ _____

☐ has been paid previously on _____
☐ is enclosed herewith.

[Page 1 of 2]

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.137(b). The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the
USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1.0 hour to
complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any
comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer,
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED
FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

12/01/2008 VBUI11 00000034 10733944

01 FC:2453

810.00 OP

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 28 2008

PTO/SB/64 (11-08)

Approved for use through 12/31/2008. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

3. Terminal disclaimer with disclaimer fee

☐ Since this utility/plant application was filed on or after June 8, 1995, no terminal disclaimer is required.

☐ A terminal disclaimer (and disclaimer fee (37 CFR 1.20(d)) of \$ _____ for a small entity or \$ _____ for other than a small entity) disclaiming the required period of time is enclosed herewith (see PTO/SB/63).

4. STATEMENT: The entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the required reply until the filing of a grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. [NOTE: The United States Patent and Trademark Office may require additional information if there is a question as to whether either the abandonment or the delay in filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional (MPEP 711.03(c), subsections (III)(C) and (D)).]

WARNING:

Petitioner/applicant is cautioned to avoid submitting personal information in documents filed in a patent application that may contribute to identity theft. Personal information such as social security numbers, bank account numbers, or credit card numbers (other than a check or credit card authorization form PTO-2038 submitted for payment purposes) is never required by the USPTO to support a petition or an application. If this type of personal information is included in documents submitted to the USPTO, petitioners/applicants should consider redacting such personal information from the documents before submitting them to the USPTO. Petitioner/applicant is advised that the record of a patent application is available to the public after publication of the application (unless a non-publication request in compliance with 37 CFR 1.213(a) is made in the application) or issuance of a patent. Furthermore, the record from an abandoned application may also be available to the public if the application is referenced in a published application or an issued patent (see 37 CFR 1.14). Checks and credit card authorization forms PTO-2038 submitted for payment purposes are not retained in the application file and therefore are not publicly available.

Sten R. Gerfast

Signature

STEN R. GERFAST

Typed or printed name

1802 VALLEY CURVE

Address

MENDOTA HEIGHTS MN 55118

Address

NOVEMBER 28 2008

Date

000080990

Registration Number, if applicable

651 454 1923

Telephone Number

FAX 651 454 1923

Enclosures: ☒ Fee Payment CREDIT CARD FORM☒ Reply 2 PAGES☐ Terminal Disclaimer Form☒ Additional sheets containing statements establishing unintentional delay☐ Other: _____

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

☐ Deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☒ Transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300.

NOVEMBER 28 2008

Date

Sten R. Gerfast

Signature

STEN R. GERFAST

Typed or printed name of person signing certificate

TOTAL 16 PAGES

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE.

6 PAGES RE-SUBMITTED

ON JUNE 27 2008

ALSO ON NOV 28 2008

In re Application of

Group art unit 2834 RECEIVED

Sten R. Gerfast

Serial No. 10/733,944

5 Filed 12/12/03

MAY 31 2005 CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 28 2008

Examiner Tran N. Nguyen

For GENERATOR WITH OUTPUT OPTIONS AND LOW LOSS WINDINGS.

Commissioner of Patents

P.O. BOX 1450

/0 Alexandria VA 22313-1450

In response to the office action dated 5/20/2005 please amend as follows:

Claim Rejections 35 USC -112

Specification is objected to due to unclear language. Claim 1-22 (Specifically claim 1 and claim 9)

The language in claim 1 is stating:

15 "each (salient poles) including alternately wound coils forming a single coil with two free ends"

is pictorially shown in Fig 1. "Each stator salient poles 110 is shown with alternately wound coils 105 forming a single coil with two free ends."

The Examiner is exactly correct in your (c) interpretation.

The pictorial (Fig 1.)

20 with three coils wound on each salient pole (alternately wound)

is showing "one free end" starting right above the number 110 and the other "free end" finishing right above the number 120.

For clarification: Remove "forming" (Line 5 Page7) and insert "coupled to form"

The new claim 1. would then read: 1. A single coil generator comprising:

25 a rotor journaled in a generator frame, said rotor having a plurality of poles,

a stator with a like number of salient poles, each including alternately wound coils,

coupled to form a single coil with two free ends, generating AC that is connected to an AC load.

⑦

Similarly with respect to claim 9: Remove "forming" (line 20 Page7) and insert "coupled to form" after "alternately wound coils ".....to clarify Claim 9.

With these clarifications that more distinctly claim the subject matter in the invention

I respectfully that all the 112 rejections be withdrawn.

5 Claim Rejections 35 USC- 103.

Claim 1-2, 4-8 and 19-22 are rejected over Weissensteiner (US Pg Pub 2004/0232796)

Weissensteiner discloses a machine that can be used as a generator that has a rotor (6)

having a plurality poles, a stator (1) with the same number of poles(4), as the rotor poles.

10 In claim 1 Weissensteiner is referring to a turn of wire when he states: "at least one coil are wound over a coiling axis" that is expanded to include "multiple coiling (turns) in claim 2 and 3.

In his figure 1 ... he shows 2 distinctly separated coilings with four free ends, with each of them inter-connecting 3 coilings separated by 120 mechanical degrees. If we number his coilings starting with coiling number 1 situated left of his numeral 1, the three, series connected coilings that are inter-connected are numbers 1,3 and 5 ending up as two free ends marked with an AC symbol.

15 His second separate "coilings" are three, series connected coilings number 2,4 and 6 ending up as two free ends marked with a AC symbol. He says that his four free ends are connected to something that he calls "consumer devices". He does not claim or states pictorially that he has:

"a stator with a like number of salient poles, each including alternately wound coils, [forming] (or coupled to form)

20 a single coil with two free ends, generating AC that is connected to an AC load." (Gerfast claim 1.)

Even if he attempted to alternately wind "coilings" on two adjacent coiling axis, with his different magnetic structure, the magnetic flux lines are "splitting" into

two separated "coilings" wound on said two coiling axis, causing a cancellation effect shown in

the enclosed modified Weissensteiner Fig 1. in color. [Exhibit "A" attached]

By using TWO times THREE coilings (W claim 3) with four free ends and two AC loads(W claim 5) he is avoiding some of this cancellation effect. His un-orthodox construction and his strong implication that his machine is operating outside of Ohms law, makes one wonder about his confusing description.

Weissensteiner [0025] " Interaction of coils can be demonstrated by short-circuiting the stator coils.

5 In a conventional generator, a short circuit produces a braking action. In the case of the present generator, however, no braking action WHATSOEVER takes place, as tests with a simple sample machine have shown. On the contrary, the drive power required FALLS BENEATH the idling power."

Ohms law for AC: Power in watts = E squared x cosine divided by Z

or for DC : Power in watts = E squared divided by the resistance If the resistance goes down

10 to a low value (or short circuit) the drive power to the generator has to increase

[unless Ohms law is cancelled] [Weissensteiner statements [0026] is it a over-unity? statement?]

[or does the inventor has a " mutual inductioncoil ...voltage increaser".] Weissensteiner [0026]

Please compare the attached Exhibit "A"..... with Gerfast Fig 1. "where the all the flux lines

(without cancellation effect) are leading through each salient stator pole

15 generating AC current in every salient pole all the time.

See also Line 4 Page 3 of the Gerfast description:

"Another object is to have a more efficient power producing winding with basically all the copper (100 %) windings in front of rotor poles at one time". This is done with: "Like number of stator/rotor poles and alternately wound coils forming a single coil with two free ends". And it is different from

20 permanent magnet motor/generators that are on the market today,

that generally are 3 phase, switching on 2 of the phases at a time, thereby using 66% of the copper at a time, and normally have un-equal number of poles; rotor poles versus stator poles.

According to the above cited differences Weissensteiner does not claim or states pictorially that he has:

"a stator with a like number of salient poles, each including alternately wound coils,
[forming] (or coupled to form)

a single coil with two free ends, generating AC that is connected to an AC load." (Gerfast claim 1 and 2.)

5 With respect to Weissensteiner's coils they are not in a position in front of the rotor poles at all the time.

Because of his construction with horseshoe magnets that have a gap between their north pole
and their south pole, his coils are not exposed to a magnetic flux when the gaps are in front of his coils.

Angular measurements shows each gap to be 15 degrees x 6 poles = 90 degrees out of 360 degree rotation
which is only 75% of magnetic flux exposure.

10 In addition his rotor poles (number 6) are severely back-set from the stator surface,
(a very wasteful use of magnetic flux) and it also magnetically decreases his effective rotor/stator width.
With respect to his dimensional width of rotor versus stator poles, it is clearly stated above
that he does not have the same dimensional width.

In his Fig 2. he does not show any support

15 for magnets, not showing any rotor, not showing any shaft.

His Fig. 4. drawing is shown with 12 separate coilings with 8 free ends, that is neither brushless
or void of slip rings.

Weissensteiner says that his coilings can be "opened", The value of which would probably
be questioned both by the Examiner and generator designers. Paralleling of coils are commonly done

20 in the industry to decrease "wind-time" by winding the coils using two wires at the same time
in the winding-needle.

The Examiners statement that : " The multiple coiling consist of coil section alternating on the periphery of the stator. The multiple coiling consists of a stator coils of two coils, separately wired to consumer devices with coil sections on the periphery of the stator in alternative sequence and connected in series" is very similar to my statement above: His two separate "coilings" are three, series connected coilings number 2,4
5 and 6 ending up as two free ends marked with a AC symbol. He says that his four free ends are connected to something that he calls "consumer devices". He does not claim or states pictorially that he has: "a stator with a like number of salient poles, each including alternately wound coils, [forming] (or coupled to form) a single coil with two free ends, generating AC that is connected to an AC load." (Gerfast claim 1.)

10 So, in general he does not have "a single coil with two free ends "and therefore does not disclose the claimed Gerfast invention.

I therefore respectfully ask that 1-2, 4-8 and 19-22 rejections be withdrawn.

Namikawa is showing a transformer circuit, that is used all over the world, that contains a bridge rectifier supplying a DC to a DC load. But it has no AC to an AC load. Namikawa does not have: "a generator output
15 split into AC and rectified DC and with the appropriate switching components .

I fail to see any obvious connection between these very different component; A transformer versus "a generator with high and low voltage, AC and DC output, plus switches to control these outputs"
I respectfully ask that the claim for obviousness be withdrawn.

With respect to Gerfast claim 5, I agree with the Examiner that the claw pole rotor is well known
20 but it has, to the best of my knowledge, newer been used in a generator that has a:
"rotor having a plurality of poles, a stator with a like number of salient poles,
each including alternately wound coils,
coupled to form a single coil with two free ends, generating AC that is connected to an AC load."

5

A search to find such a combination failed to find any in the patent field.

For that reason I respectfully ask that the "obvious" rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

I also respectfully ask that all the mentioned claim rejections be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted

Sten R. Gerfast
Sten R. Gerfast

May 31 2005

1802 Valley Curve
Mendota Heights MN 55118
Phone and FAX (651) 454 1923

Another difference is that Weissensteiner's two pole (horseshoe) type of magnets
does not generate AC at all times. [Gerfast Claim 19]

Sten R. Gerfast
MAY 31 2005

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 28 2008

Fax Sender at 6514541923

Date Received:

6/23/2006 11:37:12 AM [Eastern Daylight Time]

Total Pages:

7 (including cover page)

Cover
 Page
 11111

FAX TO TRAN N. NGUYEN OR LISA WRIGHT PHONE
 (FOR COMMUNICATION) ART UNIT 2834 571-273-1643
 APPENDIX TO PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED RESPONSE, MAILED ON MAY 31, 2006.

Circuit is loading: 10.732.944

ህጋዊነትና ምክር ቤቱ የሥራ ምክር ቤቱ

- "to single out, with two free ends, generating AC that is connected to an AC load" (Citation 1) → Does not have.
- "a stator with like number of salient poles, each including alternately wound coils" (Citation 1) → Does not have.
- "has basically all the copper (100%) windings in front of rotor poles all the time" and is generating in every single pole at all times (100%) (Page 3 line 8) → He does not state, (probably 3 phase design with a maximum of 66%)
- "is generating AC current in every salient pole at all times" (Citation 14 and Citation 1) → Does not have.
- "a generator that obeys Ohm's Law" → Apparently does not.

For other comments and arguments please refer to 7 response pages mailed on May 31 2005.

The drawing sheet has not been attached & is now marked (original)

The specification sheets have not been altered.

but if the Examiner prefers, I have included a new specification sheet number 3

with a change of the word "forming" to "coupled to firm" (This sheet is marked new Spec. sheet 3)

Reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

April 2 2006

Fax 571 273 8300

RECEIVED: 10/19/2023

This is in response to a letter to comparable response to Notice of Non-compliance Amendment received from [redacted] on 6/16/2006 (Case # [redacted])
(Received on 6/16/2006) (The Commission has voted to deny it)

The "first notice of non-compliance" mailed on 6/14/2005 asked for "Box 3 (Drawings)". As stated above and again here, the drawing sheet has not been signed. It is now wanted and requested (original.)

Box 1 The new specification sheet (unpublished) was included as an Examine's option, and does include markings. No new paragraphs were added; only change of the word "forming" to "coupled to form".

Reconsideration is cordially solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Letter Enfant 6-23-2004

Week Overload: Show is available from 6.00 AM to 6.00 PM. Please call FAX 503 434 7023: perkins@jameshall.net

PAGE 01 * RVD AT 061200Z 11-57:12 AM (Eastern Daylight Time) * SYRUSPTC-EF008-018 * DMS 271533 * CSD:55133 * 023 * DURATION: 00:00:00

Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 28 2008



TO:

Fax Sender at 6514541923

Fax Information

Date Received:

4/2/2006 7:19:49 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

Total Pages:

6 (including cover page)

ADVISORY: This is an automatically generated return receipt confirmation of the facsimile transmission received by the Office. Please check to make sure that the number of pages listed as received in Total Pages above matches what was intended to be sent. Applicants are advised to retain this receipt in the unlikely event that proof of this facsimile transmission is necessary. Applicants are also advised to use the certificate of facsimile transmission procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8(a) and (b), 37 CFR 1.6(f). Trademark Applicants, also see the Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) section 306 et seq.

Received
Cover
Page
=====>

FROM: STEN GERFAST

PHONE NO.: 6514541923

April 02 2006 07:19:49 PM

ADDENDUM TO PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED RESPONSE MAILED ON MAY 3, 2005

Gertast is teaching:

Weinsteinleber

- "a single coil with two free ends, generating AC that is connected to an AC load"
- "a stator with like number of salient poles, each including alternately wound coils"
- "that basically all the copter (100 %) windings in front of rotor poles all the time"
- "is generating AC current in every salient pole at all times"
- "a generator that obeys Ohm's Law"

Does not have

Does not have.
He does not state, (probably 3 phase design with a maximum of 66 %) "

Does not have.
Apparently does not.

For other comments and arguments please refer to 7 response pages mailed on May 21 2005.

The drawing sheet has not been altered. It is now marked (original)

The specification sheets have not been altered.

But if the Examiner prefers, I have included a new specification sheet number 5

with a change of the word "forming" to "empuled to form" (This sheet is marked new Spec. sheet 5.)

Reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Sten Gerfast
Sten Gerfast

April 2 2006

FAXED ON JUNE 27 2008
ALSO ON NOV 28 2008

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE.

June 25 2007

In re Application of

Group art unit 2834

Sten R. Gerfast
Serial No. 10/733,944
Filed 12/12/03


Examiner Tran N. Nguyen

For GENERATOR WITH OUTPUT OPTIONS AND LOW LOSS WINDINGS.

Commissioner of Patents
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

In response to the Communication Letter mailed 6/12/2007 (Received June 19 2007)
please find correction pages.

1. Additional \$165 is submitted on a Credit card form. (Sent to Supervisor Darren Schuberg)
 2. Gerfast Drawing Sheet (1/1) [1 sheet out of 1] was never altered! (A clarification sheet showing Weissen steiner Pat. Appl. 2004/0232796 that is showing a magnetic cancellation effect, not occurring in Gerfast, was included on May 31 2005)
- 2 Continued: Amended Claims pages were submitted by Fax on 6/23/06 and are RE-submitted today [6/25/2007]
Amended Specification page number 5 was submitted by Fax on 6/23/06 and is RE-submitted today [6/ 25/ 2007]
(the only word changed on Page 5 was the word "forming" that was changed to " coupled to form")
2 Continued "Supplemental Addendum sheet" was submitted on April 2 2006 and is RE-submitted today[6/ 25/ 2007]
Re-consideration is courteously requested.



Sten Gerfast June 25 2007

Page 8

FAXED ON JUNE

27 2008

ALSO ON NOV 28
2008

Supervisor Darren Schuberg Art unit 2834

Re. Application number 10/ 733944

Filed December 12 2003

Dear Mr. Schuberg: The applicant has numerous times tried to contact the Examiner for clarification:

- Phone calls to Mr. Nguyen on 6/23/06 and two weeks later, left message ; (no call back)
- Phone calls to Lisa Wright on 6/23/06, and later, left message ; (no call back)
- Written requests with my Fax, phone or E-mail address; no callback.
- My last reply was mailed and faxed on 6 23 2006.
- The reply has been in the possession of PTO since June 2006.
- The Examiner has not replied in any manner since;
until I received a communication letter almost a year later (mailed 6/12/2007)
- It does not seem fair to ask for an additional \$ 625 for extension of time when the delay is at PTO.
- I would courteously request that the "extension of time" fee be waived.

Respectfully submitted June 25 2007

Sten Gerfast

RE-SUBMITTED
ON JUNE 27 2008

ALSO DN
NOV 28 2008

REMARKS

Submitted on April 7 2008

The Gerfast generator generates AC all the time:

because "the rotor is having a plurality of poles, a stator with a LIKE number of SALIENT poles ,
each including alternately wound coils, coupled together to form a SINGLE coil with TWO FREE ENDS,
generating AC," [Gerfast Claim 1, Fig.1]

The Gerfast generator EFFICIENTLY generates AC all the time: because "ALL THE COILS are wound and connected
together into a single coil (100 % USAGE of all the windings) with the SAME NUMBER of ROTOR poles
as wound STATOR poles , with STATOR POLES and ROTOR POLES
having the SAME DIMENSIONAL WIDTH", [Gerfast Claim 16, Fig. 1]

The Gerfast generator EFFICIENTLY generates AC all the time:

because all same width " rotor poles is having PERMANENT MAGNET POLES", [Gerfast Claim 6, Fig. 1]
(Permanent magnet generators are always having a better efficiency than "claw-shaped " poles,
because permanent magnet's INHERENT magnetic flux does not need any electrical input.)

Weissensteiner does not have the above stated language nor does he have any of the claimed features.

I respectfully ask that all the mentioned claim rejections be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted

Sten R. Gerfast APRIL 7 2008
Sten R. Gerfast April 7 2008

1802 Valley Curve
Mendota Heights MN 55118
Phone and FAX (651) 454 1923

6/27/2008 SEC NO. FEE FEE \$
CODE AMOUNT 900

FAXED 6-27-2008

C.C.

RAM Fee History Query

Revenue Accounting and Management

Name/Number: 10733944

Total Records Found: 5

Start Date: Any Date

End Date: Any Date

Accounting Date	Sequence Num.	Fee Type	Fee Code	Fee Amount	Mailroom Date	Payment Method
04/08/2008	00000003	1	2452	\$255.00	04/07/2008	CC
06/27/2007	00000006	1	2252	\$165.00	06/27/2007	CC
06/26/2006	00000070	1	2251	\$60.00	06/23/2006	CC
12/16/2003	00000047	1	2001	\$385.00	12/12/2003	CK
12/16/2003	00000048	1	2202	\$18.00	12/12/2003	CK

TOTAL
\$ 1783

FEE HISTORY, NUMBER NUMBER
REFAXED ON NOVEMBER 28 2008